

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

AMIKHET EN MAATI, )  
 )  
Petitioner, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
STATE OF NEBRASKA, )  
 )  
Respondent. )

8:12CV314

**MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**

Petitioner has filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. (Filing No. 1.) The court has conducted an initial review of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus to determine whether the claims made by Petitioner are, when liberally construed, potentially cognizable in federal court. Petitioner has made three claims.

Condensed and summarized for clarity, the claims asserted by Petitioner are:

Claim One: Petitioner was denied due process of law in violation of the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments *because* (1) Petitioner has been illegally detained under an invalid order of commitment from the Sarpy County Board of Mental Health; and (2) the order of commitment was issued by Ann Ebsen (“Ebsen”) who previously served as legal counsel for Petitioner’s ex-wife in criminal proceedings arising from the same set of facts under which Petitioner was charged and convicted, and Ebsen failed to recuse herself.

Claim Two: Petitioner was denied due process of law in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment *because* (1) Petitioner did not receive a hearing within seven calendar days

of being taken into emergency protective custody as required by Neb. Rev. Stat. § 71-1207; (2) Petitioner was not served a summons of any proceedings against him in violation of Neb. Rev. Stat. § 71-1207; (3) Petitioner was detained without an evaluation pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 83-174; (4) these actions resulted in Petitioner's detainment for a period of time in excess of that allowed under Nebraska's Sex Offender Commitment Act; (5) the Sarpy County Attorney's Office engaged in prosecutorial misconduct by seeking to detain Petitioner even though the evaluation violated Neb. Rev. Stat. § 83-174.02 in several ways; and (6) the Board of Mental Health chairperson determined Petitioner's commitment on a monetary basis, which is prohibited by Nebraska's Sex Offender Commitment Act.

Claim Three: Petitioner was denied the effective assistance of counsel in violation of the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments *because* his counsel (1) failed to consult with Petitioner regarding the Board of Mental Health proceedings; (2) failed to protect Petitioner's interests at said proceedings; (3) undertook unlawful representation of Petitioner without Petitioner's express consent or a lawful appointment; (4) failed to conduct an adequate investigation; (5) failed to call witnesses; and (6) failed to follow court rules.

Liberally construed, the court preliminarily decides that Claims One through Three are potentially cognizable in federal court. However, the court cautions that no determination has been made regarding the merits of these claims or any defenses to them or whether there are procedural bars that will prevent Petitioner from obtaining the relief sought.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Upon initial review of the habeas corpus petition (filing no. 1), the court preliminarily determines that Petitioner's claims, as set forth in this Memorandum and Order, are potentially cognizable in federal court.
2. The Clerk of the court is directed to mail copies of this memorandum and order and the section 2254 petition to Respondent and the Nebraska Attorney General by regular first-class mail.
3. By November 30, 2012, Respondent shall file a motion for summary judgment or state court records in support of an answer. The Clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this case using the following text: **November 30, 2012**: deadline for Respondent to file state court records in support of answer or motion for summary judgment.
4. If Respondent elects to file a motion for summary judgment, the following procedures shall be followed by Respondent and Petitioner:
  - A. The motion for summary judgment shall be accompanied by a separate brief, submitted at the time of the filing of the motion.
  - B. The motion for summary judgment shall be supported by such state court records as are necessary to support the motion. Those records shall be contained in a separate filing entitled:

“Designation of State Court Records in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment.”

- C. Copies of the motion for summary judgment, the designation, including state court records, and Respondent’s brief shall be served upon Petitioner *except* that Respondent is only required to provide Petitioner with a copy of the specific pages of the record which are cited in Respondent’s brief. In the event that the designation of state court records is deemed insufficient by Petitioner, Petitioner may file a motion with the court requesting additional documents. Such motion shall set forth the documents requested and the reasons the documents are relevant to the cognizable claims.
- D. No later than 30 days following the filing of the motion for summary judgment, Petitioner shall file and serve a brief in opposition to the motion for summary judgment. Petitioner shall submit no other documents unless directed to do so by the court.
- E. No later than 30 days after the filing of Petitioner’s brief, Respondent shall file and serve a reply brief. In the event that Respondent elects not to file a reply brief, he should inform the court by filing a notice stating that he will not file a reply brief and that the motion is therefore fully submitted for decision.
- F. If the motion for summary judgment is denied, Respondent shall file an answer, a designation and a brief that complies with terms of this order. (*See* the following paragraph.) The documents shall be filed no later than 30 days after the denial of the motion for summary judgment. **Respondent is warned that the failure to file an answer, a designation and a brief in a timely fashion**

**may result in the imposition of sanctions, including the release of Petitioner.**

5. If Respondent elects to file an answer, the following procedures shall be followed by Respondent and Petitioner:

- A. By November 30, 2012, Respondent shall file all state court records which are relevant to the cognizable claims. *See, e.g.,* Rule 5(c)-(d) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. Those records shall be contained in a separate filing entitled: “Designation of State Court Records In Support of Answer.”
- B. No later than 30 days after the filing of the relevant state court records, Respondent shall file an answer. The answer shall be accompanied by a separate brief, submitted at the time of the filing of the answer. Both the answer and brief shall address all matters germane to the case including, but not limited to, the merits of Petitioner’s allegations that have survived initial review, and whether any claim is barred by a failure to exhaust state remedies, a procedural bar, non-retroactivity, a statute of limitations, or because the petition is an unauthorized second or successive petition. *See, e.g.,* Rules 5(b) and 9 of the the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts.
- C. Copies of the answer, the designation, and Respondent’s brief shall be served upon Petitioner at the time they are filed with the court *except* that Respondent is only required to provide Petitioner with a copy of the specific pages of the designated record which are cited in Respondent’s brief. In the event that the designation

of state court records is deemed insufficient by Petitioner, Petitioner may file a motion with the court requesting additional documents. Such motion shall set forth the documents requested and the reasons the documents are relevant to the cognizable claims.

- D. No later than 30 days following the filing of Respondent's brief, Petitioner shall file and serve a brief in response. Petitioner shall submit no other documents unless directed to do so by the court.
- E. No later than 30 days after the filing of Petitioner's brief, Respondent shall file and serve a reply brief. In the event that Respondent elects not to file a reply brief, he should inform the court by filing a notice stating that he will not file a reply brief and that the merits of the petition are therefore fully submitted for decision.
- F. The Clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this case using the following text: **December 31, 2012**: check for Respondent to file answer and separate brief.

6. No discovery shall be undertaken without leave of the court. *See Rule 6 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts.*

DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

*Richard G. Kopf*

Senior United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.